



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,286	12/31/2001	Donna K. Hodges	BS01311	7406

38516 7590 08/09/2007  
SCOTT P. ZIMMERMAN, PLLC  
PO BOX 3822  
CARY, NC 27519

EXAMINER
----------

LUDWIG, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/09/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/029,286

Applicant(s)

HODGES ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew J. Ludwig

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-13 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6-13, and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to the following communications: The amendment received 5/18/2007.
2. Claims 1-3, 6-13, and 20, have been examined, with claims 1, 6, 9, and 20, being the independent claims. Applicant cancelled claims 4, 5, and 14-19.
3. Claims 1-3, 6-11, and 14-20, remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahota.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-3, 6-13, and 20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahota, et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication, 2001/0056460 A1, published December 27, 2001, claiming priority to Provisional Application 60/199,686, filed April 24, 2000) [hereinafter "Sahota"].**

Regarding **independent claim 1**, Sahota teaches:

(See, Sahota, figures 2A-2B, and paragraphs [0024]-[0142], particularly [0054]-[0069], [0082]-[0084], and [0136]-[0142], and claims 41-50, teaching XSLT used within a "content converter" to map data into a variety of representations as a standard interface. See, particularly, Sahota, figure 2A and paragraphs [0066]-[0068].)

The reference discloses a single platform used to acquire content in one format and to transform the content in a format suitable for any number of destination devices. Furthermore, Syndication server uses content content engine to create synthesized content. Syndication server can target the synthesized content for various types of platforms. The reference fails to explicitly state the coupling an XML DTD with the XSLT business rule component, however, the suggestion of a content engine with rules and included in the architecture of the system provides a suggestion of a coupling of components. Furthermore, [0059] discloses an XML DTD conversion. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the well-known content transforming methods and the XSLT/content engine of Sahota, to modify the XSLT and content engine and utilize the XML DTD to provide a user with business-specific content because it would have provided business user with customized rich interactive services.

The Sahota reference discloses a layout designer responsible for providing the user interface for creative professionals and business users to rapidly layout and customize rich interactive services. Visual layout designer is used to provide a drag and drop environment for defining and creating the content transformation and mapping rules (compare to “when the set of buseness rules changes, then only changing the XSLT business rule component and reloading changed buseness rule component to the multiple platform-dependent engines”). See page 5, [0061 – 0063].

Device framework is responsible for managing the client side components and logic to provide a rich compelling interactive user experience. In one embodiment, set-top box is an ATVEF compliant receiver or an adnaced set-top box to deliver interactive and enhanced content (compare to “enabling a feedback loop between an input and an output”). See page 6,

Art Unit: 2178

[0062 – 0063]. It is unclear to the Examiner what exactly is meant by the term ‘input and an output’, therefore, the signals received through the set-top box suggest a feedback loop between a generic input signal and output signal.

Finally, the system taught by Sahota, provides a set-top box, a CPU, and a decoder, for the communication/exchange of data. The reference fails to explicitly state a backend bus; however, the means of communication provided by Sahota suggest a similar means of sending and receiving signals. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the well-known communication methods of Sahota and provided a description of the CPU and access to a database/business rules via web server.

Regarding **dependent claim 2**, Sahota teaches:

*The method of claim 1, further comprising:*

*providing an updated XSLT business rule component comprising updated platform independent business rules; and*

*loading the updated XSLT business rule component into the platform dependent business engine to obtain an updated business engine using the updated platform independent business rules.*

(See, Sahota, paragraph [0084], teaching the “syndication transformation manager” using XSLT and modification (updating) of the XSLT code.)

Regarding **dependent claim 3**, Sahota teaches:

*The method of claim 1, further comprising:  
employing an extensible markup language ("XML") document type definition to  
facilitate coupling the XSLT business rule component with the platform dependent  
business engine.*

(See, Sahota, paragraphs [0059] and [0136], teaching the use of XML document type definitions (DTS's) for coupling with the XSLT.)

Regarding **independent claim 6**, Sahota teaches:

*A method for providing a common business service ("CBS") unit used in  
conjunction with an application program, the CBS unit using platform independent  
business rules, comprising:  
encoding a set of business rules in extensible style language translator ("XSLT")  
to obtain an XSLT business rule component comprising the platform independent  
business rules, the XSLT business rule component operative to perform logical  
manipulations based on the platform independent business rules;  
providing a platform specific CBS unit; and  
coupling the XSLT business rule component with the CBS unit to obtain the CBS  
unit using the platform independent business rules.*

(It is noted that a common business service (CBS) is disclosed as the XSLT business rule component claimed. See, disclosure, page 3, lines 23-28.

See, Sahota, paragraphs [0054]-[0055], teaching the repository 205 to store “rules and logic” which may be accessed on demand, and which is therefore a common business service and is taught to be used with an XSLT business rule component.) The reference discloses a single platform used to acquire content in one format and to transform the content in a format suitable for any number of destination devices. Furthermore, Syndication server uses content content engine to create synthesized content. Syndication server can target the synthesized content for various types of platforms. The reference fails to explicitly state the coupling XSLT business rule component with the CBS unit to obtain the CBS unit using the platform independent business rules, however, the suggestion of a content engine with rules and included in the architecture of the system provides a suggestion of a coupling of components. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the well-known content transforming methods and the XSLT/content engine of Sahota, to modify the XSLT and content engine to provide a user with business-specific content because it would have provided business user with customized rich interactive services.

Regarding **dependent claim 7**, Sahota teaches:

*The method of claim 6, further comprising:*

*providing an updated XSLT business rule component comprising updated platform independent business rules by updating the platform independent business rules using XSLT; and*

*coupling the CBS unit with the updated XSLT business rule component to obtain an updated CBS unit using the updated platform independent business rules.*

Art Unit: 2178

(See, Sahota, figure 2A and paragraph [0084], teaching the “syndication transformation manager” using XSLT and modification (updating) of the XSLT code.)

Regarding **dependent claim 8**, Sahota teaches:

*The method of claim 6, wherein an extensible markup language ("XML") document type definition is used to couple the XSLT business rule component and the CBS unit.*

(See, Sahota, paragraphs [0024]-[0142], particularly [0054]-[0069], [0082]-[0084], and [0136]-[0142], teaching the invention of claim 6 using and XML DTD.)

Regarding **independent claim 9**, Sahota teaches:

*A method for manipulating input data and providing output data, comprising:  
encoding a set of business rules in extensible style language translator ("XSLT")  
to obtain a set of XSLT business rules;  
coupling the set of XSLT business rules with a platform dependent business engine to obtain an XSLT business engine; and  
using the XSLT business engine to:  
receive the input data from a source;  
perform a logical manipulation of the input data based on the XSLT business rules; and  
provide the output data to the source.*



Art Unit: 2178

(See, Sahota, figure 2A-2B and paragraphs [0024]-[0142], particularly [0054]-[0069], [0082]-[0084], and [0136]-[0142], teaching the XSLT business rules, coupling the XSLT business rules to a platform dependent business engine to obtain an XSLT business engine and using the XSLT business engine to receive input, perform manipulations of the input data based on the business rules, and provide output data.) The reference discloses a single platform used to acquire content in one format and to transform the content in a format suitable for any number of destination devices. Furthermore, Syndication server uses content content engine to create synthesized content. Syndication server can target the synthesized content for various types of platforms. The reference fails to explicitly state XSLT business rules, however, the suggestion of a content engine with rules and included in the architecture of the system provides a suggestion of a coupling of components. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the well-known content transforming methods and the XSLT/content engine of Sahota, to modify the XSLT and content engine to provide a user with business-specific content because it would have provided business user with customized rich interactive services.

Regarding **dependent claim 10**, Sahota teaches:

*The method of claim 9, further comprising:*

*providing updated XSLT business rules by updating the set of XSLT business rules using XSLT; and*

*updating the XSLT business engine by coupling the updated XSLT business rules with the platform dependent business engine.*

Art Unit: 2178

(See, Sahota, figure 2A and paragraph [0084], teaching the “syndication transformation manager” using XSLT and modification (updating) of the XSLT code.)

Regarding **dependent claim 11**, Sahota teaches:

*The method of claim 9, wherein a call to a remote database is made as a result of the logical manipulation.*

(See, Sahota, paragraph [0136]-[0142], teaching access to remote databases.)

Regarding **independent claim 20**, Sahota teaches:

*A computer-readable medium containing computer-executable instructions comprising:*

*a set of business rules encoded in extensible style language translator ("XSLT"), wherein the encoded set of business rules can be adaptively coupled with a platform dependent business engine using a document type definition to provide a platform dependent business engine having behavior based on the set of business rules encoded in XSLT.*

(Claim 20 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

4. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any

Art Unit: 2178

way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

***Claims Rejection – 35 U.S.C. 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 12 and 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahota, et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication, 2001/0056460 A1, published December 27, 2001, claiming priority to Provisional Application 60/199,686, filed April 24, 2000) [hereinafter “Sahota”], as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Lipkin, et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication, 2002/0049788 A1, filed January 12, 2001, and claiming priority to Provisional Application 60/176,450, filed January 14, 2000) [hereinafter “Lipkin”].

Regarding **dependent claim 12**, Sahota in view of Lipkin teaches:

*The method of claim 9, wherein a call to another business engine is made as a result of the logical manipulation.*

(Sahota teaches the invention claimed in claim 9, and teaches a call to another business engine.

See, Sahota, figure 2A-2B and paragraphs [0024]-[0142], particularly [0054]-[0069], [0082]-

Art Unit: 2178

[0084], and [0136]-[0142]. Sahota does not expressly teach that the call is made as a result of logical manipulation.

Lipkin teaches a separate “meta-data store” to hold information used to validate input data. See, Lipkin, paragraphs [0232]-[0243]. Lipkin teaches to store the data separately from the execution data of the program, and Sahota teaches to call for update information. Sahota and Lipkin are combinable in that they are in the same art of integrating disparate platforms and software applications.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the calling access function of Sahota with the separate storage access function of Lipkin.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is for the obvious advantage of accessing separately stored data, the difference between the authorities being merely limited to whether the data was stored on the same processor, Lipkin, or on a separate processor, Sahota.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Sahota and Lipkin to result in the invention specified in claim 12.)

Regarding **dependent claim 13**, Sahota in view of Lipkin teaches:

*The method of claim 9, wherein when the logical manipulation comprises a validation of the input data.*

(Sahota teaches the invention claimed in claim 9, and teaches a call to another business engine.

See, Sahota, figure 2A-2B and paragraphs [0024]-[0142], particularly [0054]-[0069], [0082]-

Art Unit: 2178

[0084], and [0136]-[0142]. Sahota does not expressly teach that the call is made as a result of logical manipulation.

Lipkin teaches a separate “meta-data store” to hold information used to validate input data. See, Lipkin, paragraphs [0232]-[0243]. Lipkin teaches to store the data separately from the execution data of the program, and Sahota teaches to call for update information. Sahota and Lipkin are combinable in that they are in the same art of integrating disparate platforms and software applications.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the calling access function of Sahota with the separate storage access function of Lipkin.

The suggestion or motivation to combine the references is for the obvious advantage of accessing separately stored data, the difference between the authorities being merely limited to whether the data was stored on the same processor, Lipkin, or on a separate processor, Sahota.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Sahota and Lipkin to result in the invention specified in claim 12.)

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 and 6-20 have been considered but are not persuasive.

The applicant argues on page 8 of the amendment the newly added language ‘storing an encoded platform-independent’ set of business rules is not taught or suggested in the Sahota

Art Unit: 2178

reference. The Examiner would like to make reference to Sahota, page 7, [0079 – 0085]. The syndication feed manager or syndication transformation manager can act as an authoring application tool. Syndication transformation manager accepts an XML stream or file output by syndication fee manager and transforms the XML stream or file for display by set-top box. Syncation transformation manager may output the XML file as HTML web page. Alternatively, syndication manager may output the XML file as another type of XML file having different XML data. The reference utilizes the syndication feed manager to store an encoded platform-independent set of business rules, as presently claimed. Also, Sahota discusses an HTML converter that uses “conversion rules” to create XML files. Sahota explains that these conversion rules are used to “create dynamic content for specific platforms and device frameworks. The template disclosed in the Sahota reference may also include macros and regular expressions. The suggestion is found within the reference for rules to be platform independent, not because the exact language is mentioned within the reference, but instead, based upon one of ordinary skill in the art, having knowledge of the HTML converter process and the platform-independent nature of the teachings found within Sahota.

Regarding the newly formed limitation, ‘deploying the XSLT business rule component across multiple platform-dependent engines or common business units’, the content created through the utilization of the HTML converter is dynamic content, which would suggest the content is constantly changing. If a change is to take place with the content the rules would change accordingly. The XML files created represent the data and properties of any service and are used to generate the user interface, interaction model, and view of the service. If a new conversion module is added then it would also require rules to be adjusted.

***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Yeung

US Pat. Pub. 2003/0140068

filed 11/26/2001

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 571-272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ML

  
STEPHEN HONG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER